

The Times-Dispatch

DAILY-WEEKLY-SUNDAY.
 Business Office: 216 E. Main Street
 Richmond, Va.
 Petersburg Bureau: 109 N. Hancock Street
 Lynchburg Bureau: 215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. One Six Three One
 POSTAGE PAID. Year. Mos. Mos. Mo.
 Daily with Sunday.....\$10.00 \$10.00 \$10.00
 Daily without Sunday.....4.00 2.00 1.00 .35
 Sunday edition only.....2.00 1.00 .50 .25
 Weekly (Wednesday).....1.00 .50 .25 .10

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

One Week
 Daily with Sunday.....10 cents
 Daily without Sunday.....10 cents
 Sunday only.....5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1910.

TAFT'S SENSIBLE SPEECH.
 Mr. Taft made a really great speech at the National Conservation Congress in St. Paul yesterday. There was nothing in it to stir the groundlings, nothing to excite the mob spirit, nothing but a plain, reasonable, intelligent discussion of "the preservation of our natural resources for economical use, so as to secure the greatest good to the greatest number." He did not call anybody a liar, or swear any oaths that this, that or the other "must be done," or prescribe the number of babies a woman must have, or say that "I demand," or "I require," or "I'll be damned," or anything of the sort. Speaking like a man fully conscious of his official responsibility as a public servant and with the true dignity of statesmanship, he impressed upon the Convention the vast importance of the work in which it is enlisted; he explained, "now that the world-beleaguers have come to realize that all the richest lands in the country have been taken up, we have perceived the necessity for a change of policy in the disposition of our national resources so as to prevent the continuance of the waste which has characterized our phenomenal growth in the past." "Conservation is not a question of politics, or of factions, or of persons." "The problems are of very great difficulty and call for the calmest consideration and clearest foresight." "A satisfactory conclusion can only be reached promptly if we avoid acrimony, imputations of bad faith, and political controversy."

With the clear head of the judge, weighing all the facts in the case, and with absolutely no disposition to emphasize his personality or to magnify his office beyond the limitations that the law has placed upon it, the President discussed his subject in orderly fashion, explaining what the law is and what the Government has accomplished in the way of preserving our agricultural, mineral, forest, coal, oil and gas lands and phosphate lands; of the relations of the States and the Nation to these several matters; of the withdrawals of public lands from settlement and exploitation; of the entries that have been made by law; of the progress in the development of the irrigation projects of the Government; of the state of the law; of the efforts he has made to make the things that ought to be so that they can be done with authority of law, the problem of conservation being, in fact, as he put it very clearly, "how to save and how to utilize, how to conserve and how to develop; for no sane person can contend that it is for the common good that father's blessings should be stored only for unborn generations."

Mr. Taft can hardly be called a strict constructionist of our own type; but he holds very decided views as to the rights of the States, which are as "refreshing as a daisy in a cow's mouth" in these days of a new nationalism. Speaking of the suggestions that have been made for national aid for the drainage of swamp lands belonging to the States or to private owners, Mr. Taft deprecates the agitation in favor of such legislation, and said yesterday:

"I am liberal in the construction of the Constitution with reference to Federal power; but I am firmly convinced that the only safe course for us to pursue is to hold fast to the limitations of the Constitution and to regard as sacred the powers of the States. We have made wonderful progress and at the same time have preserved with judicial exactness the restrictions of the Constitution. There is an easy way in which the Constitution can be violated by Congress without judicial inhibition, to wit, by appropriations from the National Treasury for unconstitutional purposes. It will be a sorry day for this country if the time ever comes when our fundamental compact shall be habitually disregarded in this manner."

Mr. Taft did not fail to mention Mr. Roosevelt and what he did for the conservation cause. The things Mr. Roosevelt did without authority of law, Mr. Taft has corrected by legislation passed by Congress at his instance. He has picked up the loose threads of the Roosevelt Administration and tied them together so that whatever has been done under his direction, whether wisely done or not, has been done decently and in order.

As to the coal measures and oil and gas lands of the Nation, Mr. Taft would have them taken care of by a system of leasing so that the Nation would be better protected in its rights and these natural resources handled with greater advantage to the people who are now and those who are to come after. He would have the phosphate lands husbanded carefully and such legislation as would insure an adequate supply for the needs of this country, making such a lease of these lands from the Government as would enable the Government to prescribe the conditions upon which the sales of

the rock from these fields might be made for foreign and for domestic consumption.
 There are difficulties in the way of handling the waterpower sites of the country, as to whether the States or the General Government should control; and, while not expressing an opinion on the subject, Mr. Taft will submit the matter to Congress and urge that one or the other of the two plans shall be adopted.

As we have said, Mr. Taft's efforts at conservation have been attended by very large results, larger than were ever obtained before. He has not been as diligent in advertising his achievements, but on the "show-down," it appears that he has been doing things of good account to the country. We agree with him fully that "the time has come for a halt in general rhapsodies over conservation, making the word mean every known good in the world," and that "such appeals are of doubtful utility and do not direct the public to the specific course that the people should take, or have their legislators take, in order to promote the cause of conservation. The rousing of emotions on a subject like this, which has only dim outlines in the minds of the people affected, after while ceases to be useful, and the whole movement will, if promoted on those lines, die for want of practical direction and of demonstration to the people that practical reforms are intended." In concluding his address to the Convention, Mr. Taft said:

"I beg of you, therefore, in your deliberations and in your informal discussions, when men come forward to suggest evils that the promotion of conservation is to remedy, that you invite them to point out the specific evils and the specific remedies; that you invite them to come down to details in order that their discussions may flow into channels that shall be useful rather than in periods that shall be eloquent and entertaining without shedding real light on the subject. The people should be shown exactly what is needed in order that they make their Representatives and their intelligent legislators do their duty intelligently."
 That has an altogether wholesome sound, and we have an idea that it came mightily near hitting somebody. After all the worry and hurry and hurry are over, the people all over the country, and away back in the country where men read for themselves and think for themselves, we are sure that they will be able to differentiate between a Man and a Mountebank.

TWO LABOR DAY SPEECHES.

Mr. Taft made a speech yesterday before the Minnesota State Agricultural Society at St. Paul in celebration of Labor Day. Colonel Roosevelt made a Labor Day speech at Fargo, North Dakota. The Colonel's speech was three or four times as long as the President's; the President's was three or four times as good as the Colonel's. The President was concise, the Colonel discursive; the President said something worth saying because he had something to say worth saying; the Colonel said something because he was expected to say something, but he said nothing new and nothing that he had not already said many times, and that he will not say again many times, so readily do his homilies, which are of the patent reversible kind, lend themselves to any occasion and any audience. The President was practical; the Colonel philosophical, for want of a better term. The President was speaking in the United States for men of flesh and blood; the Colonel was beating the air of some Utopia wherein only such creatures as Jacob Rits and Garfield and Kerby, can dwell. The President meant what he said; the Colonel didn't know what he meant by what he said. The former was clear as a mountain stream, the latter utterly "confused." A few specimen quotations from what they said will illustrate the point we have in mind.

The Colonel: "I believe in the principle of organized labor. . . This does not mean that I unequivocally indorse any and all practices that labor organizations may happen to adopt. . . Sometimes they act very well, and sometimes they act very badly; and I am against them when they act well, and I am against them when they act badly. . . Whether in a man or in an organized body of men, the power to do good means that such power may be twisted into evil; and in proportion as the power grows, so it becomes steadily more important that it should be handled aright. . . Our social organization is too complex for us to fail quickly to condemn those who, with levity or in a spirit of wanton brutality, bring about far-reaching and disastrous interference with its normal processes."

The President: "This is Labor Day—a day given over to emphasizing the importance of manual labor in our civilization and to properly exalting its dignity. . . Instead of being a mere manual vocation as it was years ago, it (farming) now has become a scientific and practical profession. . . All this legislation (enumerating it) has been in the interest of the farmers, and might be characterized as class legislation; but so great is the general public interest in the promotion of agriculture that it cannot be termed unduly privileged or objectionable. . . This legislation (the establishment of a bureau of labor, compensation for those injured on inter-State railways, the alien contract law, the bureau of mines) is in the interest and for the benefit of a class—the workmen; but they are so large a class and their welfare is so important at large that while it might be characterized as class legislation it is greatly for the public weal and cannot be dominated by privileged or objectionable. . . But there is a kind of legislation that does come under the head of vicious class legislation—the legisla-

tion that would render farmers and workmen immune from prosecution under the law which holds all other combinations in restraint of trade to account (legislation attempted at the last session of Congress). To the hands of the Executive against an unlawful combination of workmen or of any other men, if such a combination existed, and thus make any group a privileged class of law-breakers is neither justice, nor wisdom, nor good statesmanship."

We do not accept Mr. Taft's view that because the farmers are numerous and the workmen powerful, any distinction between legislation for them should be considered on any other basis than that which is applied to all the rest of the classes of our citizenship; but everybody will agree with him in his view that all transactions in every day life should be based upon the same considerations of fairness and justice as obtain between honest and just men in their dealings with one another. Our only purpose just now, however, is to invite a careful comparison between what the President said and what the Colonel said; the specimens we should say of straight thinking and of incoherent speech.

ROTATION IN OFFICE.

Thomas Jefferson firmly imbedded into American governmental theory the principle of rotation in office. Justly jealous of the centralization of power, he saw the danger that lies in the undue continuation in office of certain public servants. The principle is one that ought never to be lost sight of in a country like ours.

Yet there are limitations upon the principle, just as there are limitations upon practically every principle of government. The rule is not absolute. One of the clearest statements of the proper province in which the principle should operate is made this week in the Progressive Farmer, which says: "There is no doubt that the principle of rotation is wise and healthy, but there are one or two modifying facts which our voters should keep in mind. In the first place, a very sharp distinction should be made between the offices in which merely routine work is done, such as those of Sheriff, Treasurer, Register of Deeds, Auditor, Secretary of State, etc., on one hand, and, on the other hand, offices requiring a high degree of constructive ability and technical skill, such as Commissioner of Agriculture, Superintendent of Education, Supervisor of Roads, Health Commissioner, etc. . . It is fairly important that a distinction be made between the two types. Of course, no inefficient man ought to be kept in any office because he is supposed to have had experience in it, but we hope the wise principle of rotation is not carried to extremes."

Dr. S. C. Mitchell, of the University of South Carolina, declared the other day that while it was originally said that there were three departments of government—legislative, executive and judicial—we now recognize four—legislative, executive, judicial and educational. In the executive offices, the mere execution of political and financial machinery, it is well to have rotation, but when a really able man has been found for the management of the schools, the roads, public health work or agricultural development, there is no more reason for making frequent changes than there is for changing the professors in the State University.

"In short, let us have as much rotation as the people wish in the executive offices, but less in legislative offices, where influence comes with experience; still less in judicial offices, and least of all, perhaps, in the educational offices—provided in each case that the really able man who is doing his work well."

This is thoroughly sound. There is a wide gulf between routine efficiency and constructive efficiency. The former is more or less mechanical, but the latter requires real ability, the exercise of mental power, imagination, courage, initiative. In the non-partisan activities of government, the principle of rotation should be regarded with great caution.

If a Congressman serve his people well through a term or two and prove that he is an efficient servant, growing in efficiency, making two blades of grass grow in his district where only one grew before, gaining power and prestige, we consider him more entitled to exemption from the operation of the principle of rotation in office than the man in an executive city or county office, who has learned his routine work by heart in his several terms of office. Long experience makes for the usefulness of the member of Congress; but after a certain time the mere routine executive reaches an average of efficiency beyond which he cannot go.

The principle of rotation in office under the present Constitution applies to certain city and county officers, and we think it should be allowed to continue to do so. The "office-holding trust" is fundamentally undemocratic.

AN IDEAL PRESIDENT.

The Boston Globe, in the course of a most inaccurate characterization of the presidential administrations of the United States, says of the term of President Polk: "Polk's administration was fairly successful in general and entirely successful in the War with Mexico. Yet the end of his term found him even more insignificant in national politics than when, to the surprise of the country, he was first nominated." How superficial seems this criticism when compared with that made by George Bancroft, the Massachusetts historian: "His (Polk's) administration, viewed from the standpoint of results, was perhaps the greatest in our national history."

In the short span of one term, Polk accomplished as much as any predecessor in office in a like time and much more than many of them put together. "The results of his administration were brilliant in the extreme. He was loyally upheld by the votes of all parties in Congress, abundantly supplied with the sinews of war and seconded by gallant and competent officers in the field." The successful culmination of the War with Mexico covered Polk's administration with glory. The southwestern boundary of the country was carried to the Rio Grande, while the provinces of New Mexico and upper California were added to the national domain. "What that cession meant in increased wealth it is perhaps even yet too soon to compute."

The chief event of Polk's internal administration was the enactment of a tariff law in 1846, which was based on the principle of a tariff for revenue only. In his first annual message to Congress, Polk made his position on the tariff clear: "The terms 'protection to American industry' are of popular import, but they should be applied under a just system to all the various branches of industry in our country. The farmer or planter, who tills yearly in his field, is engaged in 'domestic industry,' and is as much entitled to have his labor 'protected' as the manufacturer, the man of commerce, the navigator or the mechanic, who are engaged also in 'domestic industry' in their different pursuits. The joint labors of all these classes constitute the aggregate of the 'domestic industry' of the nation, and they are equally entitled to the nation's 'protection.' No one of them can justly claim to be the exclusive recipients of 'protection,' which can only be afforded by increasing burdens on the 'domestic industry' of others."

Under his administration, Texas, Iowa and Wisconsin were admitted to the Union; and all necessary acts for the addition of Oregon were done in his term of office. Many other important acts are recorded within the compass of the four years that Polk was President. Faithful to his declaration, Polk retired to private life when his term was rounded out. He did not allow himself to be even thought of as a candidate for a second term. His name was not presented at the convention of his party. In a little more than two months after he had laid down the responsibilities of the Presidency, he died. He left office "with the determination not to re-enter public life." Had he lived, it would have been in peace and privacy.

In his four years in the chief magistracy of the nation he heaved straight to the line. "Time and time again his enemies sought for grounds on which to convict him of inconsistency, but so consistent had been his public career that the charge was never even made." He was "steadfast to opinions once formed, and not easily moved by popular opinion." These qualities of his character did not permit him to drift from the path which he had marked out for himself; and when he left the White House, it was with the consciousness of duty fully done, of unclouded and high devotion to the public weal.

No wonder, then, that an eminent historian recently spoke of him as "an ideal President," as he reflected on present conditions in this republic. Here was a man who did not seek the Presidency, and who at the outset deliberately put aside the thought of a second term, who was not swayed by party or pride or prejudice, and who served the people with remarkable success. His administration was one of the most constructive in American history. There was in this lofty man no lust for office or for the applause of the populace. He was a great President.

MR. ROOSEVELT INSULTED.

The incident at Fargo yesterday, when a crazy fool insulted Mr. Roosevelt by calling him a liar, will do the cause of Socialism no good, if the fellow is really a Socialist, as reported, which we very much doubt. It was a most unpleasant incident, and is to be greatly deplored. It does not matter how much Mr. Roosevelt has indulged, or may indulge, in this sort of argument, it is wholly indefensible in others. There ought to be some very severe punishment provided by statute for offenses of this kind. The question asked by the man was impertinent and, when he was answered truthfully by Mr. Roosevelt, his characterization of Mr. Roosevelt's answer was little short of criminal. But Mr. Roosevelt, this is the mob spirit which you have been arousing by your own intemperate speech, the spirit from

which we should all pray that our country shall be spared.

CAN'T IT BE PATCHED UP?

Pinchot did not meet Mr. Taft in St. Paul yesterday, having left town before he arrived to meet a previous engagement to speak against Taft in the Fifth District. "P. R. K.," the faithful Jenkins of the Baltimore Sun, reported on Sunday that "some consider the absence of Mr. Pinchot tomorrow as significant, and due to his disinclination to meet and greet the President." "Ain't that awful, Mabel?" Isn't there some way by which Pinchot can be adjusted, mollified with ointment, brought into a receptive state of mind? Wouldn't he be willing to forgive and forget everything if Mr. Taft would only get rid of Graves, who has been doing fine work, and give him back his job? Couldn't this whole thing be patched up by the dismissal of Ballinger, the appointment of Garfield to take his place, and the firing of Graves so that Pinchot could get back once more into harness?

RELIGION IN BOSTON.

"Rita" has been writing things for the New York Times about what she has observed of manners and customs and religions in the crowded towns of this country. "Rita" is English, you know. She was much impressed by the density and variety of the religious atmosphere of Boston, where she found 300 churches, chapels and meeting-houses, and which she described as a place that "invents and exploits religion as other cities invent and exploit industries," and as offering "creeds to suit all tastes." She seemed to be particularly impressed with Christian Science and with what she heard about Mrs. Eddy, both in Concord and Boston, which "only left the impression that most of her followers were attracted in the first place by the sublime selfishness of a creed that deals purely with physical ills and their remedy; a sick person is an easy convert, and a cured person always an enthusiastic one."

"Mrs. Eddy's own personal record is one of perpetual sickness, perpetual hysteria and perpetual 'claims' on the time and attention of any one who would heal her. Despite the fact of there being no pain, no sickness and only the fallacies of 'mortal mind' to deal with, the high priestess of Christian Science is a very poor example of either faith or patience. When her wretched, her broken friendships, her lawsuits, her maternal indifference and her evident predilection for connubial life, are scarcely things deserving the eulogy of her critics."

"Rita" admits, however, that "the cult, or religion, or whatever it calls itself, is now a well-organized and very wealthy one," and if she knew Boston as well as some of us know it on this side of the pond, she would know that in Boston, in religion as in business and politics, nothing succeeds like success. She would also admit, doubtless, that Boston cannot have too much religion, whatever its character.

So many ladies do not seem to be chewing gum in the street cars as a little while ago.

The animals in the menagerie behaved very well yesterday. As the herd of noble elephants paraded through the streets, one could not help wondering why anybody should have cared to travel thousands of miles to kill such impressive creatures.

Job, Hedges contributed a very interesting article to the New York Times two Sundays ago about Mayor Strong's administration of that town before it became Greater New York, correcting a number of historical blunders and making it appear that Mayor Strong really counted for a good deal in the way of better government. But the thing we can't quite understand is why the Judge looked so fierce when he sat for his portrait in the Times.

One of the stories going the rounds in South Carolina, according to the Spartanburg Herald, is that "C. C. Featherstone was once drunk in Spartanburg." "And we have reason to believe," says the Herald, "there is not one word of truth in the statement." We don't believe the story, but, even if it were true, it would only the better qualify Mr. Featherstone to rightly judge the evils of intemperance, and particularly if he bought his liquor in Spartanburg.

The Ohio Democratic State Committee has decided not to invite Mr. Bryan to speak in the present campaign in that State. Yet Mr. Bryan is one of the greatest speakers in the world.

"The real thing" appears to have had nearly as much of a reception in St. Paul yesterday as the man who used to be, the press reports say, that 200,000 people turned out to greet the President. It will get more and more like this as time passes. "They are like grass which growth up. In the morning it flourisheth and groweth up in the evening it is cut down and withereth." Hear these words, Henry Watterson, and keep out of the fight as long as you can, if you really think there is going to be any fight.

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Confederate Pensions.
 Please answer in your Query Column if the Auditor of Virginia will pay Confederate pensions this September. We had our checks last year in time to go off on Labor Day.

PARKER.
 The Auditor is now engaged in sending out checks for pensions, dated September 1. They are sent out to the counties in alphabetical order. Within a reasonable time all will be delivered.

The Sealman's Status of Washington.
 I shall be greatly obliged if you will answer in your Monday or Tuesday's Query Column whether or not Washington, D. C., is considered as a Southern city. We were speaking about the "sentiment" of the different sections, and I said that Washington is certainly considered a Southern city. M. E. B.

In a sense, Washington is a Southern city, by reason of its geographical situation and the large Southern element in its population. Strictly speaking, it is neither Northern nor Southern. It is national.

Spencer and Myers Families.
 I am seeking information regarding the descendants of one William Spencer, a circuit rider, who traversed portions of Virginia in 1780-1790. Can you give the address of persons by the name of Spencer of Myers, who are likely to be those I seek? I have tried in various ways to find these people, but so far have been unsuccessful. My address is P. O. Box 722, South Clark Avenue, Mexico, Mo. Probably members of these families who read this will communicate with you.

Admission to Home for Needy Confederate Women.
 1. Please give the name and address of the person to whom I ought to write in order to ask for admission to the Home for Needy Confederate Women in Richmond.
 2. What is considered by competent Southern judges the best history that has been written of the war between the Confederacy and the Yankees?

Floral Experimental Work.
 Would thank you to inform me through your Query Column if the United States government has any experimental work in progress.

Mount Vernon.
 How large is the Mount Vernon estate? VIRGINIAN.

The estate consisted originally of several thousand acres, of which about 1,000 acres were sold to the Government in 1863 for \$200,000 by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, a patriotic organization organized in 1854. An additional tract of thirty-five acres was presented by Jay Gould in 1887, a total of 237 acres being now included in this national memorial.

MARRIAGE NOT VALID IN EYES OF THE LAW.
 BY LA MARQUESE DE FONTENAY.
 ALTHOUGH the Cardinal Primate of Belgium announced at the beginning of the month that the Belgian monarch had been ecclesiastically married to the so-called Baroness Vaughan, and had thus satisfied the requirements of the law of the church, yet the union had no validity in the eyes of Belgian or French law, owing to the omission of the legal requirements in connection with the alliance. It was this alone that enabled the woman to marry a second time, and the monarch's death her steward and general factotum, Emmanuel Durieux, who was formerly a non-commissioned officer of the French army, had been the King's lawful wife, even monogamously, she would, according to Belgian law, have been obliged to wait a year before remarrying.

Had she been legally married, moreover, to King Leopold, she would, in fact, have become a Belgian, whereas she wedded Durieux the other day as a Frenchwoman. The French authorities declined to permit the marriage under the name and title of Baroness Vaughan, which she had borne through her association with King Leopold, but which was purely a matter of fantasy, since the King had no power to bestow upon her any title with the consent of his ministers, under the great seal of Belgium.

She was married to Durieux as "Blanche Josephine Delacroix," and incidentally was thought to legitimize the first time that before making the acquaintance of Leopold she had been married to a man of the name Emmanuel Durieux and had been divorced by him.

The question now arises as to whether the Emmanuel Durieux whom she just married, and who is now about fifty years of age, is not identical with the Emmanuel Durieux who divorced her when, after leaving the court of the Emperor, she became a cafe chantant and variety diva in Paris. If so, it would explain many things for it would show why Leopold was so jealous of Durieux, to whose presence in the entourage of the fair "Carolus" she called, and who, he objected, and who on one occasion was requested by the Belgian police to leave the kingdom, as he proposed to marry a French woman, and to himself from the Chateau de Ballinacourt.

That the woman's life will be as comfortable and luxurious as during the lifetime of Leopold is extremely doubtful, for Emmanuel Durieux is addicted to drink, and when in his cups is extremely violent. It is perhaps because he is brutal that she consented to marry him, and that she is now with her present partner, the big fortune bequeathed to her by her royal uncle, and to her children, who, judging by recent developments and discoveries, are more likely to have been the offspring of Durieux than of the septuagenarian and slowly-dying Leopold.

When the late Lord Calthorpe died, some weeks ago, it was expected that his brother, Lieutenant-General Sir Somerset Gough-Calthorpe, would succeed not only his peerage, but also the very extensive estates which have hitherto always gone with the peerage, which yield an income of over \$1,000,000 a year. But when they do a large amount of real estate in Birmingham. When the will, however, came to be probated, it was found that the whole of the property in question had been left to the late Lord's eldest daughter, the Hon. Rachel Gough-Calthorpe, married to the Hon. Anstruther, and that the entail had been broken some time between 1905 and 1907, when the late Lord's only son, Walter, or, of course, Walter had joined in the steps necessary to the breaking of the entail, but that he does not seem to have been communicated to the late peer's younger brother and present successor, so that the discovery that all the property of the peerage had been alienated therefrom comes to him in the nature of an extremely disagreeable surprise.

There is an American interest in the matter, since the late Lord Calthorpe's eldest son and heir has an American wife in Mary, daughter of Oden Hottel Burrows, of Newport, R. I. The Birmingham property, which was nearly all that district known as Edgbaston, was purchased in 1730 for a mere song from Lord Paunton, by Lord Calthorpe's ancestor, Sir Richard Gough, who had amassed a fortune in the India and China trade, and who was knighted by King George I.

Whenever Empress Eugenie's flight from the Tuilleries on the day of the fall of the Napoleon III. regime in 1870 is discussed the question is always raised as to why the Empress did not flee to an American city, such as New York, where she could have found refuge. The late Lord Calthorpe's son, Walter, who was knighted by King George I.

Commission of Lynchburg Collector.
 Your many subscribers in Lynchburg would like you to publish in the columns of your valuable paper the following information. We have been unable to have it published in local papers. We call on the public to call on the collector of Lynchburg, and what does this commission aggregate per annum? We call on the public to call on the collector of Lynchburg, and what does this commission aggregate per annum? We call on the public to call on the collector of Lynchburg, and what does this commission aggregate per annum?

How large is the Mount Vernon estate?
 The estate consisted originally of several thousand acres, of which about 1,000 acres were sold to the Government in 1863 for \$200,000 by the Mount Vernon Ladies' Association, a patriotic organization organized in 1854. An additional tract of thirty-five acres was presented by Jay Gould in 1887, a total of 237 acres being now included in this national memorial.

Make this Bank Your Bank.
National State and City Bank
 OF RICHMOND, VA.
 Capital . . \$1,000,000.00
 Surplus . . \$ 600,000.00

W. M. H. PALMER, President.
 JOHN S. ELLIOTT, Vice-President.
 J. W. RINTON, Vice-President.
 JULIEN H. HILL, Cashier.

Three per cent. per annum interest allowed on all deposits compounded every six months.